

## REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 16-22 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 7 and 11-15 are cancelled. Claims 16-22 are new. Claims 2-6 and 8-10 are amended to clarify the claimed subject matter in view of new claims 16 and 18.

This amendment is fully supported by the specification, and more particularly by paragraphs [027] to [028] and [046] to [053] of the description. No new matter is added by the present amendment.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zollinger et al. (US Patent No. 6,321,236).

In response, the Applicant submits the new claim set as provided hereinabove with the following arguments.

Concerning claim 16, the Applicant submits that Zollinger et al. does not teach that, upon receipt of the first reply from the shared storage medium, the common task is executed at the client computer using the data element stored in the client computer; and upon receipt of the second reply, the data element stored in the client computer is modified using the received data element prior to executing the common task.

Claim 16 defines that execution of a common task and/or modification of a data element stored at the client computer occurs upon receipt of, and therefore is dependent on, replies received from the shared storage medium.

Zollinger teaches away from claim 16 because Zollinger decouples synchronization with a server database from execution at client computers. Zollinger indicates that client data is typically changed independently of the server, as clients are usually not in contact with the server: “The invention applies particularly to clients that are only intermittently connected to the server synchronizer component 46.” (col. 7, lines 30-32)

Zollinger further indicates that client data is typically changed independently of the server, stating that clients may change the data in the client copies of the database table (see col. 7, lines 43-46), but that “if such changes are made to the client copy of the database tables by the

client, the changes will not be propagated back to the original table managed on the server computer and could actually be lost when update instructions are received by one of the clients 48a – 48n.” (col. 7, lines 47-50).

For the above reasons, Zollinger teaches away from making execution at the client computer dependent on a reply from the server. In contrast, the presently claimed invention requires that execution of a common task at the client computer is dependent on a reply from the server.

In view of the above, the Applicant therefore respectfully submits that new claim 16 is allowable over the teaching of Zollinger et al..

Further in view of the arguments provided hereinabove concerning new claim 16, new claims 17-18, which are directed to similar subject matter, are also believed to be allowable.

With specific reference to claim 17, Zollinger et al. does not teach or fairly suggest a limitation wherein “when an application executing on the computer attempts to access a selected data element: send a request to the shared storage medium, (...); and receive from the shared storage medium one of: a first reply (...); and a second reply (...)” as required by new claim 17.

Similarly for claim 18, Zollinger et al. does not teach or fairly suggest “receiving a request from a respective client executing on a given computer and attempting to access a selected data element (...); when the version number contained in the request matches the current version number, sending a first reply to the client, the first reply including a confirmation that the version number of the selected data element contained in the request is valid; and when the version number contained in the request does not match the current version number, sending a second reply to the client, the second reply including the selected data element along with the respective current version number” as claimed in new claim 18.

Claims 2-6, 8-10 and 19-22, which depend on either one of claims 16-18, are also believed to be allowable for reasons similar to those provided for independent claims 16-18.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 4 depends indirectly from new claim 16. Accordingly claim 4 is not believed to be patentable over Zollinger et al. in view of Rust et al. for at least the reasons presented above.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes presently submitted claims 2-6, 8-10, 16-22 are allowable and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Iain B. FINDLETON et al.

By: /Kent Daniels/  
(Reg. No. ° 44206)  
Customer No. 020988